

present form is presented to the conferees as including some rather extensive changes to that provision. Some say it does not matter what you do to that provision, it is not appropriate. That may assuredly be so, and yet that is called legislating and it is about discussing and amending.

So it is now worded so that at least those who are opposed to any form of illegal immigration reform are not now able to say that we are "kicking schoolchildren out into the streets." No one I know is interested in "kicking children out into the streets." I certainly am not, and I have always had some serious problems with regard to aspects of the Gallegly amendment, but if that is what is to be in this conference report in this form, in its amended form, then it is certainly acceptable to me.

The proposal contains generous "grandfathering" provisions for those students now in school. They will be permitted to continue their education in the elementary or secondary school in which they are now enrolled at no charge. If they wish to change school districts in the same State or advance from elementary to secondary school, they may do so upon paying tuition, or a fee equal to the actual cost that others who are citizens pay within that district for their education.

Furthermore, the proposed change will ensure that unless the Congress is given an opportunity to vote on repealing this provision in 30 months, the provision will sunset—be gone. At the end of the 60 months, if a bill to repeal the measures is introduced there must be a vote within 90 days or the provision will sunset—be gone.

Those changes to moderate the provision were negotiated by Senators HATCH and SPECTER. They represent, obviously, substantial modifications to the elements that were there originally that were apparently the most objectionable. I believe they might be sufficient to make the bill acceptable to those who truly want illegal immigration control legislation.

But there are some very disappointing signals, I share with my colleagues, some very disappointing signals from the Dole campaign. I think that my fine leader, who I served as assistant for those 10 years—a most wonderfully decent man—is being ill-served on this issue. If what I read in the papers and hear through the media is true, and those who know me please believe that it is, indeed, always taken with a huge grain of salt by me as to what is in the media—indeed, that will always be so, hopefully—but I am informed he is being advised by those who advise these people who choose to submit themselves to seek the role of the Office of Presidency—that he is being advised simply to let the bill die. And the reason for that, apparently, is so, as I gather it, that the President will not have a Rose Garden ceremony with regard to illegal immigration; that apparently because the President

had a Rose Garden ceremony with regard to welfare reform and with regard to health care and with regard to, I guess, anything else that he signs, that somehow this then cripples the effort of my friend, Bob Dole.

Thus it is rather extraordinary to me that those on my side of the aisle often accuse this administration of cynical politics and yet I can't imagine anything more cynical than not signing an illegal immigration bill or working for its passage—something that was passed by such overwhelming margins—on the basis that it is simply going to "help the incumbent" turning our backs on the singular issue that is reflected in polls across the country for years, and that is to "do something" about illegal immigration.

There is and always has been overwhelming public support for measures to reduce illegal immigration. Both candidate Dole and President Clinton have stated their support for illegal immigration control legislation. I say to my colleagues, it is in the national interest to achieve control over our borders, to achieve control over illegal immigration and the misuse of our most generous public support and welfare programs that so burden the taxpayers of this country.

When we have 60 percent of the live births in a certain hospital in California attributed to illegal undocumented mothers who then give birth to a U.S. citizen; when we have people who are minorities who go to seek public support because they need it and are then told that the cupboard is bare because it has all gone to illegal, undocumented persons, that stirs people up. They don't like it, and it really shouldn't be the guiding policy of anything we do here, but it is the way it is.

So I just say, apparently the scenario is this now. I gather in my wisdom: Pass the bill in the House with the Gallegly amendment, which will be adopted; send it over here, and then it will be filibustered by those who do not like the Gallegly amendment. I guess they think all of those people are Democrats. And then we will point our bony fingers at all the Democrats and say, "They brought down illegal immigration."

That is childish logic, because there are at least 10 to 12 Republicans in this body who do not like the Gallegly amendment in any form and who will assist in the filibuster. So if anybody thinks it is just going to be a wonderful roundelay over here of Democrats filibustering an illegal immigration bill and then we pointing the bony fickle finger of fate at those who destroyed the issue. No.

So, I guess that is where we are. We will pull the bill down and try to blame it on the Democrats and go home. Clever, not, because as I say, there are at least 10 to 12 Republicans who will join in that filibuster. Go home in October and tell voters a Republican Congress did nothing about illegal immigration in an election year.

Then we also heard, "Well, if we just send it to President Clinton and he vetoes it, we will win California." I never went for that scenario. I think that is about as boneheaded as you can get, too. But when they are telling us that my dear friend, Bob Dole, should do nothing and nothing should happen, and that is going to help Bob Dole, I must say I have purely missed out on most of the trickery and cynicism of the campaign, because there are many on our side who will have nothing to do with the Gallegly amendment. Not me, for I am ready to do the modified version.

So what the public will see is a distorted figure of my friend, Bob Dole. We have had enough of those. Ten years as his assistant, I know him well. He will win the Presidency of the United States if the people of the United States come to know him as well as I do and as well as we do here, as well as my friend from Montana knows him, and he surely does, as well as the occupant of the chair.

Each and every week for the past 2 years, Bob Dole has said to me, "When will we have an immigration bill, AL?" And now we have one. Now we have people pulling at Bob Dole, mewling, puling, mumbling issuing from staff and others. He is being ill-served if he is led to believe that it is not a priority issue. And if California is in the balance, as we say in politics, by doing nothing, someone will have cut the tightrope wire for one great and decent man, my friend Bob Dole.

So perhaps we can move on now with the national interest. There is no one who expresses it more in its most honest form than that most wonderfully decent and capable man, Bob Dole. We shall see how it plays out.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. It is my understanding that the hour from 1 to 2 p.m. is under my control and/or my designee; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is correct. We are in morning business until 2 o'clock, and from 1 to 2 o'clock is under the control of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Thank you, Mr. President.

CRIME IN AMERICA

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, as most people know now, over the weekend, our former Senate majority leader announced in very broad, very specific, very forceful terms his plan to come to grips with a surging, raging crime wave in the United States.

All the data that I have seen over the last several years have indicated that crime, drugs, and the related two, are at the top or near the top over and over of grave concern on the part of American citizens. And well they should be,

because at least the first premise of Government is to protect the persons and property and citizens of the United States.

You cannot separate drugs from crime. Today, of the 80 percent of the 35,000 prisoners that are incarcerated in my State, they are very in prison from drug-related actions. As our attorney general, Attorney General Bowers, has said over and over again in Georgia, you can no longer separate the two. We are in the midst of a new drug epidemic; therefore, we will be in the midst of a surging crime epidemic.

There is no way to fully document the ill-effect that the drug epidemic, drug-related crimes have done to the citizens of our country, and in the cost of lives, personal property. It is stunning data any time you look at it. It just begs for leadership to come forward.

Over the weekend, Senator Dole said that if he were elected President, he would cut teen drug use in half. What does that mean? That means that two million youngsters would not be using drugs, when he is successful, that are today. I can not think of a more important commitment to make to America than to turn the drug war back on and to put the warning out to families and churches and business leadership across our country that we would have an administration that is going to be highly focused on drug use among teenagers.

As we all know now, drug use among teenagers has doubled in the last 36 months. It has gone up 33 percent in the last 12 months alone. And, in addition to the broad tragedies that we suffer by those individuals who have been ensnared in the drug epidemic, there will be hundreds and hundreds of families, in each case, that are caught up by the reaction to drug use and the crime that it festers.

We have the distinguished Senator from Montana who has joined us here this afternoon. I know he has had a long interest in the issue of crime and its impact on America. I yield up to 7 minutes to the Senator from Montana on this subject.

Mr. BURNS. I cannot have the rest of that?

Mr. COVERDELL. We will amend that as needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Chair, and I thank my good friend from Georgia.

We have just got in some interesting figures from Montana. I guess that is why some of us are very concerned about this, not only from a political standpoint—this is the season, and nobody can lift that out of this, out of the element of debate—but if you ask Americans today, “Do you feel safer than you did 4 years ago,” we hear an overwhelming, “No.” People are feeling threatened more and more in society. I think it comes from this old mindset of “only obey the laws you agree with.” It is a mindset.

Just in my State of Montana, violent crime has gone up 8 percent last year, and overall crime has gone up 16 percent since 1994. That concerns me because we are a small State. We are known as a State with hardly any crime, but there was a murder every 10 days last year—that concerns me—a rape every 38 hours; a robbery every 34.5 hours; property crime occurred every 13 minutes; and burglaries happened at a rate of 1 every 2 hours. That sort of concerns me a little bit.

Before I had the opportunity to serve here in the U.S. Senate, I served on the board of county commissioners in Yellowstone County. We built a new jail facility and went through that process of detention centers, and we also received a very nice award for a youth detention center. I was convinced, as we went through that process, that somewhere in this crime prevention, or how we deal with crime, there has to be some common sense injected in here.

We know that we cannot outbuild the criminal element to just lock up everybody. So we have to find ways not only to deter—one of them is not getting on television and having a low disregard for the laws of the land. You know, as adults, we teach our youth every day, some days we even use words. But that concerns me more than anything else because I have a young son, I have a daughter who will graduate from medical school next year, and they are concerned about crime and crime among the young people.

When we take a look at what we did in Yellowstone County in a youth detention center, I think we have to work with States, because the real violent offenders in crime, I don't think we can do much but just hold down on them and keep them in confinement. I think we should work to abolish the very liberal parole rules that some States have. I do not think there is anything wrong—and why should it be wrong—to require drug testing for those under supervision in the criminal justice system.

I ask the American people why it is wrong to establish a registry for the release of violent sex offenders, the Megan's law. I see no reason why we should not move forward on that. And child pornography, we have to move on that. But juvenile crime worries me more than anything else, because I guess I got into politics because of youth. I have sort of a soft spot in my heart for them.

I have worked very much with 4-H groups and FFA groups, and those are kinds of groups—can you imagine any other kind of group than the Future Farmers of America where you can pour 31,000 of them, with those blue jackets, in downtown Kansas City, and you never have to put an extra cop on the beat? We need to be promoting those kinds of youth groups that espouse their way of thinking and the way they act. I know every Senator in this body gets calls from their local FFA chapters across this country.

So we have to do some things that deter crime. We have to promote those groups and organizations that do have their values in the right place. We have to ask some of the hard questions. But some of them are going to have to have common sense, too. The alarming increase of teen drug use, marijuana use, between 12- and 17-year-olds has increased some 200 percent in the last 2 years—200 percent. Why? We had it going down for a while. We had it going down by just one little statement from the First Lady in the White House, who said, “Just say no.” We need to help them say no; and when they say no, stick by them. That is what we have to look at. It is concerning to me that we would look at it any other way.

Do we want to prosecute juveniles as adults for adult crime? Maybe sometimes. Maybe we should use some common sense there and provide past criminal records for juveniles in sentencing. There is nothing wrong with that.

We came a long way in attacking the root cause of crime and drugs in the inner city a few short weeks ago when we passed the welfare reform bill. It deals with dependency and illegitimacy in ways that have never been tried before. It is a big step in the right direction, and yet the job is not over.

When we take a look at what is ahead of us, we have to start appointing judges that interpret the law—do not make the law, interpret the law. The elected officials of this country make the laws. Judges interpret them. We need to start appointing Federal marshals and prosecutors that want to prosecute drug dealers and child pornographers rather than making excuses for them that they were just victims of society. If there has ever been a cop-out in America, it is some psychologist or some person who is saying, “Well, they're victims of society, and leniency should be shown.” That is a one-way ticket down the drain for this country, when we start making excuses for people who knowingly break the law.

Let us take another end of it—victims' rights. I think we ought to have an amendment to the Constitution. Victims have to have some rights. All the rights are not with the felon. It is time to reform the court system, limit appeals, and punish criminals quickly. Keep violent criminals behind bars so they cannot commit more crime. It is time to stop these election-year games and take a stand for what is right. We should just do what is right.

I was in Illinois on Saturday for my friend Bob Dole. How many mothers did I talk to that are concerned—they have teenagers in high school in rural areas. Where they have never had problems before, they are coming up with these problems and saying there has to be a more liberal way of dealing with discipline and all those elements.

I imagine most of us who serve in this body, when we were in school, if you got a licking in school, you got one when you went home. They did not ask

why you got a licking. They did not even ask. My dad did not even ask whether I was right or wrong. The fact is you got a licking, and if you warranted one there, you warranted one here. There was a time I was a victim of society. There was a time when the whole world was against me and I was that victim. I do not think it hurt very many of us.

I want to say one word. Not only can we do something here, but we adults, like I said a while ago, we teach every day. Some days we even use words. We are going to have to get on the ground with these young people and we are going to show them they have support to do the right thing, not the wrong thing. It has to be done here. It has to be done across our Nation, and, yes, the national leaders have to set the example. I am asking America, what kind of example are we setting?

I yield back my time.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the Senator from Montana. I think he would agree with me that this five-point plan where Senator Dole pledges to cut teenage drug use in half—by 50 percent—to end revolving door justice, to hold violent juveniles accountable for their actions, to make prisoners work, and to keep guns out of the hands of criminals is exactly the prescription to get at the tone and the issues that the Senator from Montana alluded to.

Mr. President, we have been joined by the senior Senator from Mississippi, a long and loyal colleague of our former Senate majority leader. I yield up to 10 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi on this matter.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Georgia for yielding me this time. I join him in commending the distinguished Senator from Montana for his remarks.

Our former colleague has proposed a very important new plan to deal with what has to be the most serious challenge that our governments—Federal, State, and local—face today, the epidemic of crime and violence in our society.

This plan has meat to it. It has substance to it. It is thoughtful. If we will embrace it and join Bob Dole in seeing that it is enacted and administered in the way it is proposed, I think we will get results. It is time we turned the country around, turned the country around from ever-increasing drug abuse and violent crime to an era when people assume responsibilities for their own actions and they are held accountable for their own actions, whatever their age, and that they are treated in a way that deters action in the future that is a menace to innocent society members.

In our society we have a number of efforts that are underway to try to deal with the core problems. There is a wonderful program called Character Counts. In Ocean Springs, MS, during the week of October 13-19, the schools will have special programs to observe

the importance of good character in not only students, but faculty, administration officials, and the communities at large across America. We need to restore America to the place where we have been looked up to as an example for the rest of the world in terms of community spirit, recognition of what is right and wrong, a country that stands for democracy and principles of freedom that have been an inspiration to many countries all over the world.

What this program suggests is there are six essential elements or core pillars to good character: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, caring, citizenship, and fairness. These are important and indispensable individual traits if we are to have a successful, free society. It is on that basis and on that premise that I think Bob Dole establishes this five-point plan of action. An essential part of this is holding juveniles accountable for drug abuse, for criminal acts, and for other violations that put the safety and security of others in jeopardy.

Something has to be done about it. Something is being done about it, but not enough. We need to do better. We need stronger leadership, a better example of leadership at the top. That is a part of this, too. An example is that we have seen the abuse of drugs go up by 105 percent for teenagers between the ages of 12-17 from 1992 to 1995. Before that time, drug use was going in the other direction. It was going down. Now it has turned and is going up again. We have to ask why.

What does this lead to? A third of all juvenile criminals are under the influence of drugs at the time of their criminal offense. That is what happens. There are consequences for everybody for the failure to exert good, commonsense, strong, committed leadership in this area.

I traveled one day with the sheriff of Hinds County, MS. He told me, as we looked firsthand at some of the problems in the largest populated county in my State, he said public enemy No. 1 in the State of Mississippi is crack cocaine. I am sure that is the case in many, many, other towns and communities and cities throughout this country. What do we do? We have a White House that cut the programs to deal with this. They cut the Office of Drug Control Policy by 83 percent. They cut the number of drug agents. The U.S. attorneys used to be challenged by the President and the Attorney General to do something about those who are committing offenses with guns. There was an Operation Triggerlock, you remember, an effort to go out on the streets and get those who are using guns to commit violent acts and crimes and lock them up, put an end to it. Take the guns away from them.

What is being done now? The arrests for that kind of behavior are down considerably in this administration. I think we need to turn it around. I think the five-point program Bob Dole has recommended is just what we need.

We need to make the fight against drugs a top national priority again. We need to support his effort to create 1,000 new community-based antidrug coalitions.

There is another part of this plan that strikes me as being very important. We need to have the Federal Government assisting, supporting, helping States and local communities deal with this problem, not imposing arbitrary new, hard-to-follow regulations that are expensive, that make it more difficult to operate prisons, that do a variety of things that really undercut the efforts being made by law enforcement at the State and local level.

He suggests that we assist the States in keeping violent criminals behind bars completing their sentences.

There is another part—holding juveniles accountable for their actions. The distinguished Senator from Georgia mentioned that. Youth violence is on the rise. Mr. President, 35 percent of all violent crimes are committed by those who are younger than 20 years of age. What Bob Dole is recommending and what we are suggesting is a good idea is to revise the Federal juvenile justice system to hold juveniles accountable.

The Senator from Tennessee, FRED THOMPSON, is chairman of the Juvenile Justice Subcommittee here in the Senate. He recommended a new approach to try to find out what programs at the local level are working, support them with Federal assistance and initiatives that reward those for following these paths and these new procedures, and to do something about those who commit crimes as juveniles; consider treating them as adults in certain circumstances. No longer coddle the juvenile just because he is younger, because some are more dangerous than adults. That is what has been overlooked.

This administration has done absolutely nothing about that, absolutely nothing. The program that he is suggesting will authorize new funds to assist in the investigation and apprehension of juvenile offenders, collect and distribute juvenile records to help better deal with this problem, and authorize new funds to be spent on prevention programs that involve parents and community based groups.

That example I cited a while ago, the Character Counts Program, is a good example of something that could be done on the prevention side. We are not talking about punishing everybody in an arbitrary or cruel way. We are talking about a balanced approach to doing something more likely to be successful in this area. One thing that I am convinced Bob Dole will do, in accordance with the plan that he proposed, is that he will end the interference by Federal judges and Federal agencies into the proper administration of State prisons. It is about time.

There is also a part of the program that deals with keeping guns out of the hands of criminals. We have heard about the National Instant Check Program. We had that as part of the crime

bill. He wants to make it a top priority in order to prevent criminals from purchasing any type of gun. There is a procedure for it. He will, as President, instruct the Attorney General to target violent crime by making maximum use of Federal law to get dangerous gun using criminals off the streets and into prison. That is reminiscent of Operation Triggerlock—I assume that is exactly what we will have reinstituted again—which has been abandoned and turned down and discontinued by this President. There was an emphasis on the U.S. attorneys going after those who commit crimes using guns. There has been a noticeable dropoff in prosecutions for those crimes by this administration.

In conclusion, what does this action plan do? It provides a sound, sensible, thoughtful blueprint for coordinated Federal and State efforts to combat violent crime and reverse the current trends in the use of drugs that have led to so much violence in our society.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Mississippi very much for coming forward and speaking to this critical issue of crime and the tragedy it is causing across our country, and for highlighting these very targeted suggestions that we now have from Senator Dole to get at this core problem. I appreciate very much the Senator's remarks here this afternoon.

Senator JOHNSTON from Louisiana has just come on the floor. He has a very distinguished guest.

I yield 2 minutes to Senator JOHNSTON for the purpose of this introduction.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS EXCELLENCY JASSUM MOH'D AL-OWN, KUWAIT MINISTER OF ENERGY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I have the high honor of introducing to my colleagues here in the United States Senate the distinguished minister of energy from the country of Kuwait, His Excellency Jassum Moh'd Al-Own, who happens also to be a Member of the Parliament of Kuwait.

This is a very important time between our two countries. We have sealed the friendship between our two countries in battle, and that friendship persists, and will persist as long as there is a Kuwait and as long as there is a United States, which will be for many centuries, we all hope.

So, Mr. President, with a great deal of pleasure, I introduce to my colleagues the distinguished Minister of energy from Kuwait. [Applause.]

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

CRIME IN AMERICA

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, undoubtedly, Senator Dole's emphasis on taking crime head-on is an outgrowth of a circumstance over the last 3 years that has just turned sour on us. It has been alluded to, but I want to cite some of the facts that have developed in the last 36 months.

First of all, I want to make it clear that there can be no doubt about it that, in the last 36 months, the United States has found itself, once again, in a massive drug epidemic. It is fueling and will continue to fuel crime. Just to cite this, in the last 36 months, marijuana use is up 105 percent, LSD is up 130 percent, cocaine up 160 percent. Somebody in the administration suggested that, actually, drug use is down. I have no idea where that data is coming from, but it must be a single source, because every other source has documented that drugs were up in virtually every category. The sad thing, Mr. President, is that they are kids.

In the last epidemic, during the 1960's and 1970's, it was a target group from about 16 to 20. It has dropped, which is such a tragedy. Now the ensnarement is occurring at age 8 to 13. This country is going to feel the impact of that for a long, long time. One in every 10 kids is using drugs.

Drug prosecutions are down 12 percent. This administration cut 625 drug agents. Federal spending on drug interdiction has been cut by 25 percent. The drug czar's office was reduced by 83 percent. On the list of national security threats, compiled by the National Security Council, this administration moved illegal drugs from No. 3, as a threat, to No. 29 out of 29.

Now, Mr. President, can there be any wonder that our children are getting the wrong message, and that they no longer think drugs are a risk, and that, therefore, they are using them in record numbers, and that, therefore, we have an epidemic, and that, therefore, we are having the emergence of a new crime wave?

Mr. President, we have been joined by one of our colleagues that has been in the center of this controversy during his entire time, which is since 1994. The distinguished Senator from Michigan is already making an impact in this area of vital concern across our country.

I yield up to 15 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S VETO BY LAWYERING

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia, again, for his efforts to bring us together here to focus on various vital matters before the Senate and before the American people.

Mr. President, I have taken the floor on several previous occasions to discuss the problem of abusive prison litigation and this Congress' efforts to attack that problem.

The last time I did so was April 19, 1996. At that time, I expressed my disappointment that President Clinton

had just vetoed the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill.

Contained in that bill was the Prison Litigation Reform Act, a carefully crafted set of provisions designed to stem the tide of prison litigation.

In my view, this was a very important piece of legislation. Lawsuits by prisoners and lawsuits over prison conditions were completely out of hand.

One figure captures the situation very well. In fiscal year 1995, prisoners—inmates in prison—filed 63,550 civil lawsuits in our Federal court system. That is a little over one-quarter of all the civil lawsuits filed in Federal courts that year. It's also far more than the 45,788 Federal criminal prosecutions initiated that fiscal year.

In short, Mr. President, we saw, in fiscal year 1995, prison lawsuits outnumber prosecutions under our Federal system and account for one-quarter of all the lawsuits brought in this country in the Federal system.

One prisoner sued because he had been served melted ice cream. For this he claimed \$1 million in damages. Fortunately, the judge ruled that the right to eat frozen ice cream was not one of those the Framers of the Constitution had in mind.

Another sued because when his dinner tray arrived, the piece of cake on it was "hacked up."

A third sued demanding LA Gear or Reebok "Pumps" instead of Converse tennis shoes. This kind of abusive litigation is not only frivolous, it costs money and cost the taxpayers a lot of money.

The National Association of Attorneys General estimated that the States were spending about \$81 million to battle cases of the sort I just described—this even though the States win 95 percent of these cases early in the litigation for reasons that are obvious.

We were determined to do something about this problem in the Congress, so as part of the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill in 1996 we passed the Prison Litigation Reform Act. This legislation charged prisoners a fee for filing any lawsuit, while making it possible for the prisoners to pay that fee in installments. If a prisoner filed more than three frivolous cases, however, the prisoner would no longer be able to pay the filing fee in installments. He or she would have to pay the full fee up front, unless a court found this would create imminent risk of bodily harm.

In addition, prisoners who filed frivolous lawsuits would lose their good time credits, thus making their stay in prison longer. And judges were given authority to screen out frivolous cases on their own.

The legislation was designed to put an end to another aspect of the prison litigation problem: Seizure by Federal judges of the power to run prison systems. These seizures have consequences that range from the ridiculous to the disastrous.

In my own State of Michigan, judicial orders resulting from Justice Department lawsuits have resulted in